

Attorney Docket: 030702  
U.S. Application No.: 10/740,746 Examiner: Lemma Art Unit: 2132  
Response to October 17, 2007 Final Office Action

## REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action dated October 17, 2007, the Assignee respectfully requests continued examination and reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application.

### Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-7 & 9 under § 103 (a)

Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,370,629 to Hastings, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0194470 to Grupe.

These claims, however, are not obvious over the proposed combination of *Hastings* and *Grupe*. These claims recite, or incorporate, many features that are not disclosed or suggested by *Hastings* and *Grupe*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites "*querying a remotely located server for a current time*" and "*preventing manipulation of a local clock setting by preferring the current time obtained from the remote server*." Support for all these features may be found at least in the as-filed application at paragraph [00106]. For the Examiner's convenience, independent claim 1 is reproduced below, and independent claims 12 and 23 recite similar features.

1. A system for controlling computer access, the system comprising:

at least one user profile for at least one respective user, each user profile indicating access times that the respective user is authorized to access a computer, including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer, wherein each user profile is customizable for the respective user;

means for querying a remotely located server for a current time;

Attorney Docket: 030702  
U.S. Application No.: 10/740,746 Examiner: Lemma Art Unit: 2132  
Response to October 17, 2007 Final Office Action

means for preventing manipulation of a local clock setting by preferring the current time obtained from the remote server;

means for comparing the current time to the time restrictions; and

a control unit to regulate user-access to the computer according to the user profile of a current user of the computer.

*Hastings* and *Grupe* cannot obviate all these features. *Hastings* discloses a GPS receiver that is used to provide access to stored information. See U.S. Patent 6,370,629 to *Hastings, et al.* at column 1, lines 58-62. A "local atomic clock" may also provide time signals. *Id.* at column 3, lines 19-23. The actual time is compared to a time interval. See *id.* at column 2, lines 31-35. Access may then be denied before or after the time interval. See *id.* at column 2, lines 47-50. *Grupe* discloses access time periods for a file or application. See U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0194470 to *Grupe* at paragraph [0026].

Even so, *Hastings* and *Grupe* cannot obviate independent claims 1, 12, and 23. *Hastings* and *Grupe*, for example, fails to teach or suggest "*querying a remotely located server for a current time*" and "*preventing manipulation of a local clock setting by preferring the current time obtained from the remote server.*" Because the proposed combination of *Hastings* and *Grupe* fails to teach or suggest at least these features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claim 1 is obvious.

Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9, then, cannot be obvious over *Hastings* and *Grupe*. Both *Hastings* and *Grupe* fail to teach or suggest the features recited by independent claim 1. The dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. As *Hastings* and *Grupe* are silent to many of the claimed features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that these claims are obvious. Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9, then, cannot be obvious, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

**Rejection of Claims 4-5, 8, 10-16, 19-20, 23-26 & 29-30 under § 103 (a)**

Attorney Docket: 030702  
U.S. Application No.: 10/740,746 Examiner: Lemma Art Unit: 2132  
Response to October 17, 2007 Final Office Action

Claims 4-5, 8, 10-16, 19-20, 23-26 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Hastings* in view of U.S. Patent 5,991,807 to Schmidt, *et al.* and further in view of *Grupe*.

Again, though, these claims cannot be obvious over *Hastings*, *Schmidt*, and *Grupe*. These claims respectively depend from either independent claim 12 or 23. As the above paragraphs explained, independent claims 12 and 23 recite the same distinguishing features as discussed in independent claim 1. As the above paragraphs explained, both *Hastings* and *Grupe* fail to teach or suggest “querying a remotely located server for a current time” and “preventing manipulation of a local clock setting by preferring the current time obtained from the remote server.” *Schmidt* does not cure these deficiencies. *Schmidt* discusses time and day restrictions to authorized Internet destinations.

Even so, *Hastings*, *Schmidt*, and *Grupe* cannot obviate independent claims 12 and 23. *Hastings*, *Schmidt*, and *Grupe*, for example, fails to teach or suggest “querying a remotely located server for a current time” and “preventing manipulation of a local clock setting by preferring the current time obtained from the remote server.” Because the proposed combination of *Hastings*, *Schmidt*, and *Grupe* fails to teach or suggest at least these features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claims 12 and 23 are obvious.

Still, though, claims 4-5, 8, 10-16, 19-20, 23-26 and 29-30 cannot be obvious over *Hastings*, *Schmidt*, and *Grupe*. The combined teaching of *Hastings*, *Schmidt*, and *Grupe* still fails to teach or suggest the features recited by independent claim 12 and 23. The dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. As *Hastings*, *Schmidt*, and *Grupe* are silent to many of the claimed features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that these claims are obvious. Claims 4-5, 8, 10-16, 19-20, 23-26 and 29-30, then, cannot be obvious, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

**Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-7 & 9 under § 103 (a)**

Attorney Docket: 030702  
U.S. Application No.: 10/740,746 Examiner: Lemma Art Unit: 2132  
Response to October 17, 2007 Final Office Action

The Office also rejected claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Hastings* in view of U.S. Patent 5,265,221 to *Miller*.

Again, though, these claims cannot be obvious over *Hastings* and *Miller*. The patent to *Miller* discusses an access control mechanism and restrictions based on time, day, and location. See U.S. Patent 5,265,221 to *Miller* at column 1, lines 47-55. Still, though, *Hastings* and *Miller* cannot obviate independent claim 1, from which claims 2-3, 6-7 and 9 depend. The proposed combination of *Hastings* and *Miller* fails to teach or suggest at least “*querying a remotely located server for a current time*” and “*preventing manipulation of a local clock setting by preferring the current time obtained from the remote server*.” Because the proposed combination of *Hastings* and *Miller* fails to teach or suggest at least these features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claim 1 is obvious. The dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. As *Hastings* and *Miller* are silent to many of the claimed features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that these claims are obvious. Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9, then, cannot be obvious, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

**Rejection of Claims 4-5, 8, 10-32 under § 103 (a)**

Claims 4-5, 8, and 10-32 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Hastings* in view of *Schmidt* and further in view of *Miller*.

Again, though, these claims cannot be obvious over *Hastings*, *Schmidt*, and *Miller*. As the above paragraphs explained, *Hastings*, *Schmidt*, and *Miller* all fail to teach or suggest “*querying a remotely located server for a current time*” and “*preventing manipulation of a local clock setting by preferring the current time obtained from the remote server*.” As claims 4-5, 8, and 10-32 recite, or incorporate, these features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that claims 4-5, 8, and 10-32 are obvious. The Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

Attorney Docket: 030702  
U.S. Application No.: 10/740,746 Examiner: Lemma Art Unit: 2132  
Response to October 17, 2007 Final Office Action

---

If any questions arise, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or [scott@scottzimmerman.com](mailto:scott@scottzimmerman.com).

Respectfully submitted,



Scott P. Zimmerman  
Attorney for the Assignee  
Reg. No. 41,390